

The Bulletin.

"AND CLINTON"

When the judiciary article of the new constitution was taken up for consideration, on the 21st inst., Mr. Wall moved to strike the words "and Clinton" out of the seventh line, and insert them before the word "Madison." In the eighth line, the object of this motion was to get Judge Breese out of the First Judicial District, it being an admitted fact that he can defeat any person who may contest with him for judicial honors. This object was not sought to be obtained because Mr. Wall, or any person in Southern Illinois, has any objections that can be urged against the character, abilities or public worth of Judge Breese, but for a purpose altogether distinct from hostility to that eminent jurist and distinguished gentleman, and that purpose was to secure to the Supreme Bench the services of another eminent lawyer and well-known gentleman. At least, we have been informed that this is the fact, and we have no reason to doubt the credibility of our informant. It is a pity that such a patriotic purpose was frustrated by the stubbornness of men who desired to keep Judge Breese out of the Second Judicial District, so that they may secure to the Supreme Bench the services of still another eminent lawyer and distinguished gentleman in whom they feel an interest. We are sure the people of the First Judicial District are better able to elect Supreme Judges than the people of the Second Judicial District, and that, therefore, Mr. Wall's motion should have been adopted. If it had been, we of the First District would have given to the Supreme Court two Judges, and, as a matter of course, the most able judges on the bench. In June Judge Breese will be elected under the present constitution, in this Grand Division, and will hold his office under the new constitution nine years. If Mr. Wall's motion had been adopted this man, elected by us in June, would become under the new constitution the representative of the Second District on the Supreme Bench, and we of the First District would have selected another person to represent us. To this arrangement the Second District had the impudence to object; and the BULLETIN, innocent of guile as a babe unborn, being blamed for instrumentalism in the result, lost the advertisement of a dear friend, who also discontinued his weekly paper. How unfortunate! We shall now be compelled to trudge along without the support or friendship of a gentleman whose good opinion we esteem, and whose elevation to the Supreme Bench was our heart's desire, and he will be compelled to read a copy of the BULLETIN paid for by some one of his numerous friends.

THE MOUND CITY MARINE WAYS.

We copy the following notice of the Mound City Marine Ways and shipyard from the Journal, of that place, and are much pleased to observe that such honorable and excellent gentlemen as Messrs. Hamilton, Collier & Co., are commanding so large a share of the business in their line. The Journal says: Messrs. Hamilton, Collier & Co. have nearly completed the extensive addition they are making to their ways. The new building will contain all the machinery requisite for finishing cabin work, which will enable the enterprising proprietors to compete with any ship builders on the western rivers. They have heretofore labored under the disadvantage of having to do much finishing work by hand which might have been done by machinery. Messrs. H. C. & Co. are now laying the timbers for one of the largest and staunchest barges that ever graced the eye of a boatman in the west. It is 215 feet long, has 40 beam and 8 1/2 feet hold. The timber put into it is as fine as ever seen, being as good an article of white oak as can be selected in Southern Illinois. The barge is for the Memphis and St. Louis Transfer Co.

NEGROPHILISM.

A bill to enforce the 15th amendment by virtue of the authority conferred on Congress by the second session, thereof was reported to the Senate Tuesday, by the Judiciary committee. It is similar in its proposition to the bill for the same purpose which the house committee has decided to report, but unlike the house bill, it seems to assume on its face that such legislation is actually necessary before universal suffrage can be enforced in states where it is prohibited by local laws. Fine and imprisonment are provided for all persons who hinder or delay any citizen from voting. Provision is made for the recovery of any office of which any one has been deprived by throwing out colored votes. Further provision is made for the president to enforce the law if needed by military force.

Wendell Phillips has just hurled a dreadful anathema, which, without intending it, falls on the heads of many of the orator's most devoted friends. In a recent harangue to the new African voters, he said:

Mothers, you may forget the name of your first born; children, you may forget the Multiplication table, but whilst your race stands as it does today, mothers, never forget the name of the man in political life who has either ignominiously or maliciously given a vote for your race. Charge your sons and husbands when they go out to vote, and when the law gives you the right to vote, go out also with a firm determination, no matter what his party or name may be, if he has once voted against you, strike his name from American politics, and bury it as completely as if he were forty feet under the Rocky mountains.

If this advice should be followed, there would hardly be room enough under the Rocky mountains to bury the Radical objects of the malediction.

PERSONAL.

Verdi is in Paris.

Gov. Jewell, of Connecticut, has been made a Knight Templar.

Jamauscheck has paid a four-hour visit to the Empress Eugenie, by request.

Norfolk, Virginia, has named a new hotel after George Peabody.

Mrs. McFarland-Richardson advertises Richardson's New Jersey estate for sale. She might have waited a little.

Dickens' after-dinner speeches are to be published and illustrated—with plates, naturally.

Brussels thinks Victor Hugo will wed a rich young lady there, and Paris cries, "Hugue-not!"

The marriage of Mrs. Griffin, United States army, at Washington, to Count Esterhazy, takes place in May.

It is said that Miss Adeline Patti Caux strains and fatigues her voice more now than she was allowed to do when under the management of M. Strakosch.

The Syracuse Journal thinks Grant will shirk the decision between Hall and Hayes. There is no money in it, and he can't be expected to take the responsibility.

Ex-Governor Bigler, of Pennsylvania, is on a tour of observation through east and middle Tennessee, where, with a number of capitalists, he has invested largely in land.

Major Hulbert, father-in-law of the late General Rawlins, was thrown from his carriage at Danbury, Ct., on Friday, and received such injuries that he died on Sunday.

Charlotte Cushman, it is rumored, intends to give up her house in Rome, and reside permanently in this country. The American colony in Rome will by this decision, lose one of its most valuable members.

The New Bedford Mercury says Jim Fisk, Jr., is not satisfied with the honor of being colonel of the Ninth New York regiment. He stated, a day or two since, that there was one other distinction that he craved—that of being elected dean of a church in Bristol, R. I.

The charming duchess of Parma, niece of the Count de Chambord, is the lucky recipient of the holy golden rose which the Pope blesses annually, and presents during Lent to one of the princesses of the Bourbon family.

We have it upon the authority of the Manchester Union, that Mr. McFarland desires the jury to find her husband guilty, and hopes that he may be sent to prison for life. This information was conveyed to the Union by a friend who has been in that city and attended the trial.

NEW APPOINTMENT.

Census of 1860—Probable Census of 1870—Present and Probable Number of Representatives for Each State.

[From the New York Tribune.]

We assume that the Senate will not seriously—or, at least, not successfully—attempt to overturn the decision of the House that, for the next decade, the number of Representatives in Congress shall be two hundred and seventy-five, with such additions only as the admission of new States may, from time to time, involve. These will hardly exceed five in all, or one each from Utah, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming and Dakota, as they shall severally be admitted. (We assume that New Mexico will be admitted at this session, so that her member will be one of the 275.)

In the following table, we present: 1. The total population of each State, as returned by the Census of 1860; 2. The estimated population of such State according to the Census about to be taken; 3. The number of its present Representatives in Congress; 4. The number it will probably be entitled to under the new Census. We think this will vary but one each from the actual number in any case, and not at all in most instances.

States	Population in 1860	Probable in 1870	Reps. in 1860	Reps. in 1870
Maine	685,279	750,000	3	3
N. Hampshire	235,073	250,000	3	3
Vermont	213,098	225,000	3	3
Massachusetts	1,235,000	1,350,000	10	10
Connecticut	480,147	500,000	4	4
R. Island	114,000	120,000	2	2
New York	3,440,742	3,750,000	31	31
New Jersey	1,272,000	1,350,000	5	5
Pennsylvania	1,988,770	2,200,000	20	20
West Virginia	324,000	350,000	3	3
Virginia	1,272,000	1,350,000	8	8
N. Carolina	952,607	1,050,000	7	7
S. Carolina	705,812	715,000	4	4
Georgia	1,057,329	1,100,000	7	7
Fla.	545,435	600,000	5	5
Alabama	1,340,841	1,400,000	11	11
Mississippi	1,711,755	1,800,000	10	10
Louisiana	1,741,111	1,800,000	10	10
Arkansas	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,000	9	9
Ind.	1,075,111	1,150,000	8	8
Ohio	2,080,000	2,200,000	13	13
Michigan	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Wisconsin	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Minnesota	1,174,000	1,250,000	6	6
Iowa	674,948	700,000	4	4
Illinois	1,194,317	1,300,		